

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF

PROPOSITION 60

Politics has been called "the art of the possible." In a letter to President Kennedy, John Kenneth Galbraith once said: "Politics is not the art of the possible. It consists of choosing between the disastrous and the unpalatable." Even if, as proponents of Proposition 60 argue, the election scheme contained in Proposition 62 is disastrous, Proposition 60, which purports to save us from Proposition 62, is nonetheless unpalatable.

Proposition 60 only deals with general elections. The measure is silent on how primary elections will be conducted, leaving the door open for potential voting mischief that can adversely impact the right of parties to select their nominees. If the supporters of Proposition 60 truly wish to protect "full free and open debate" they should have included permanent constitutional protection defining the direct primary. Californians deserve the stability of a system that prohibits the members of one party from ~~meddling~~ meddling in the primaries of another.

Nowhere in the support arguments for Proposition 60 do you see mention of what Proposition 60 does to actually force the sale of surplus property in California. That's because Proposition 60 doesn't force the sale of surplus

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF

PROPOSITION 60

property – it only directs that the money raised IF surplus property is sold be used to pay off bond debt.

In seeking to compromise, the backers of Proposition 60 stopped short of what needs to be done. Twice.

That may be practicing the art of the possible, but it is no less “unpalatable”

and deserves a no vote.

Senator Bill Morrow

Assemblymember Sarah Reyes

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES